

*Oligodon travancoricus* and Jerdon's *O. venustus*. With the latter I am very familiar. I examined specimens of each, side by side, and failed to discover any reason for separating the two. Turning to Mr. Boulenger's Catalogue (Vol. II, 1894, pp. 235 and 236), the only differences are apparently as follows:—

<i>travancoricus.</i>	<i>venustus.</i>
(1) The frontal shield is shorter than the parietals.	The frontal shield is as long as the parietals.
(2) 3 infralabials touch the anterior chin shields.	4 infralabials touch the anterior chin shields.
(3) Dorsally there are bars.	Dorsally there are paired spots, usually united mesially.
(4) <i>Habitat</i> .—Travancore Hills.	<i>Habitat</i> .—South West India.

With regard to the first point I found that in one of the three specimens of *travancoricus* the frontal was fully as long as the parietals. The contact of the infralabials and anterior chin shields is not very constant in many species of this genus.

The dorsal mark in *venustus* are subject to considerable variation, the degree to which the spots are separated or confluent, as they are in other species, notably *O. subgriseus*. In the specimens of *travancoricus* indentations in the cross bars mesially and laterally are as pronounced as one sees in some specimens of *venustus*. Finally the habitat of *travancoricus* is contained within that of *venustus*. I think there can be little doubt that *travancoricus* has no claims to be considered distinct from *venustus*.

F. WALL, C.M.Z.S., F.L.S.,  
MAJOR, I.M.S.

ALMORA, 25th February 1914.

No. XXXIV.—ARE NOT THE SNAKES *SIMOTES THEOBALDI*  
(GUNTHER) AND *SIMOTES BEDDOMII* (BOULENGER) ONE  
AND THE SAME SPECIES?

In Mr. Boulenger's Fauna of British India, Reptilia and Batrachia (1890, p. 314) a snake is described under the title *Simotes beddomii*, which I cannot dissociate from Gunther's *Simotes theobaldi* for the following reasons. I have examined the two type specimens (the only specimens known) of *Simotes beddomii* in the British Museum, and being familiar with *S. theobaldi*, at once remarked upon the similarity between the two. A comparison of the two supposed species failed to show me any difference between them worthy of remark. In Boulenger's Catalogue (Vol. II, 1894) both are figured on plate IX, and the striking similarity between them is very noticeable. The descriptions of the two on pages 229 and 230, critically examined, show differences as follows:—

<i>beddomii.</i>	<i>theobaldi.</i>
Ventral, 167 to 168.	Ventrals 171 to 180.
Subcaudals 43 to 46.	Subcaudals 34 to 42.
Tail $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{2}{3}$ bodylength.	Tail $\frac{1}{12}$ to $\frac{1}{13}$ bodylength.
A few scattered ventral spots posteriorly.	No spots on belly or square black spots posteriorly.
<i>Habitat</i> .—Wynad.	<i>Habitat</i> .—Burma.

I have now seen at least 15 specimens of *Simotes theobaldi* from Burma with a range of ventrals from 164 to 180, and a range of subcaudals from 30 to 42. The trifling differences in the ventral shields recorded in Mr. Boulenger's work therefore disappear.